arXiv:1702.06631v1 [math.DG] 22 Feb 2017

COHOMOLOGICAL TAUTNESS OF SINGULAR RIEMANNIAN FOLIATIONS

JOSÉ IGNACIO ROYO PRIETO, MARTINTXO SARALEGI-ARANGUREN, AND ROBERT WOLAK

February 23, 2017

Abstract. For a Riemannian foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on a compact manifold M, J. A. Álvarez López proved that the geometrical tautness of $\mathcal{F}$, that is, the existence of a Riemannian metric making all the leaves minimal submanifolds of M, can be characterized by the vanishing of a basic cohomology class $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_M \in H^1(M/\mathcal{F})$ (the Álvarez class). In this work we generalize this result to the case of a singular Riemannian foliation $\mathcal{K}$ on a compact manifold X. In the singular case, no bundle-like metric on X can make all the leaves of $\mathcal{K}$ minimal. In this work, we prove that the Álvarez classes of the strata can be glued in a unique global Álvarez class $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X \in H^1(X/\mathcal{K})$. As a corollary, if X is simply connected, then the restriction of $\mathcal{K}$ to each stratum is geometrically taut, thus generalizing a celebrated result of E. Ghys for the regular case.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Singular Riemannian Foliations 3
3. Tautness of Riemannian Foliations 6
4. Thick foliated bundles 8
5. Local structure of SRFs 12
6. Tautness of Singular Riemannian Foliations 15
7. Appendix 19
References 23

1. Introduction

1.1. **Tautness and cohomology.** A foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on a manifold M is said to be (geometrically) *taut* if there exists a metric such that every leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ is a minimal submanifold of M. Tautness is a relevant property of foliations, which has been extensively studied since the eighties and nineties of the last century. It is essentially a transverse property:

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C12, 37C85.

Key words and phrases. Singular Riemannian foliations, foliations, tautness.

The first author is partially supported by the UPV/EHU grants EHU12/05 and EHU12/34 and by the Spanish MICINN grant MTM2010-15471.

A. Haefliger proved that if M is compact, the tautness of $\mathcal{F}$ depends only on its transverse structure, namely, on the holonomy pseudogroup of $\mathcal{F}$ (see [Hae80, Theorem 4.1]).

In the case of Riemannian foliations (those admitting a bundle-like metric, that is, a metric whose orthogonal component is holonomy invariant), tautness is remarkably of topological nature, as the following results show. In [Mas92], X. Masa proved that if $\mathcal{F}$ is an oriented and transversally oriented Riemannian foliation, then it is taut if and only if the top degree group of the basic cohomology is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}$, as conjectured by Y. Carriere in his Ph.D. Thesis. In [AL92], J.A. Álvarez López defined the so-called *Álvarez class* (or tautness class) $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_M \in H^1(M/\mathcal{F})$ whose vanishing characterizes the tautness of a Riemannian foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on a compact manifold M. As a corollary, he removed the assumption of orientability of Masa's characterization. Another immediate consequence of Álvarez's result is that any Riemannian foliation on a simply connected and compact manifold M is taut, which was proven previously by E. Ghys in [Ghy84, Théorème B]. One more characterization is obtained by combining these results with F. Kamber and Ph. Tondeur's Poincaré duality property for the basic cohomology [KT84, Theorem 3.1]:

$$H^*(M/\mathcal{F}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(H_\kappa^{q-*}(M/\mathcal{F}); \mathbb{R}) \,, \tag{1.1}$$

where q is the codimension of $\mathcal{F}$ and the κ-twisted basic cohomology $H^*_\kappa(M/\mathcal{F})$ stands for the cohomology of the basic de Rham complex with the twisted differential $d_\kappa\omega = d\omega - \kappa \wedge \omega$. It follows that, under the assumptions of Masa's theorem, $\mathcal{F}$ is taut if and only if $H^0_\kappa(M/\mathcal{F}) \cong \mathbb{R}$. For an account of the history of tautness and cohomology of Riemannian foliations see [RPSAW09] and V. Sergiescu's Appendix in [Mol88].

1.2. **Tautness of strata of singular Riemannian foliations.** We are interested in finding the singular version of those results in the less explored framework of a singular Riemannian foliation (SRF, for short) $\mathcal{K}$ on a compact manifold X. We now summarize some results we have obtained in this direction.

One major difference with the regular case is that, in an SRF, geometrical tautness is not to be achieved globally: there exists no bundle-like metric on X making all the leaves of $\mathcal{K}$ minimal submanifolds of X (essentially, because they are of different dimensions, see [RPSAW08, p. 186] and [MW06]). It is natural, then, to focus on the foliations $\mathcal{K}_S$ induced by $\mathcal{K}$ on each stratum S, which are regular. Notice that strata may not be compact submanifolds of X. The mean curvature form for non-compact manifolds has a different behavior: Example 2.4 of [CE97] describes a Riemannian foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on a non-compact manifold M whose mean curvature form κ is basic, but not closed, showing that the Álvarez class may not even be defined if M is not compact.

Nevertheless, in [RPSAW08] and [RPSAW09] we proved that, for a certain class of foliations called CERFs, the Álvarez class is well defined and the characterizations of tautness described above hold. CERFs are regular Riemannian foliations on possibly non-compact manifolds that can be suitably embedded in a regular Riemannian foliation on a compact manifold called zipper.

The main point is that the singular strata of an SRF are CERFs. Although the compactness of X does not imply the compactness of the strata, each stratum will inherit

the cohomological behavior of tautness from its zipper. Hence, the rich classical cohomological study of tautness applies to each stratum of any SRF defined on a compact manifold.

1.3. **Main result.** In this work we intend to understand the tautness character of all strata globally, by showing that the topology of X has, indeed, a strong influence on the tautness of each stratum, individually. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF on a closed manifold X. Then there exists a unique class $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X \in H^1(X/\mathcal{K})$ that contains the Álvarez class of each stratum. More precisely, the restriction of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X$ to each stratum S is the Álvarez class of $(S, \mathcal{K}_S)$.*

We will say that $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X$ is the *Álvarez class* of $\mathcal{K}$, and that $\mathcal{K}$ is *cohomologically taut* if its Álvarez class vanishes. To prove Theorem 1.1 we shall need to exploit the local description of the neighbourhood of a stratum of an SRF, and use strongly the fact that its associated sphere bundle admits a compact structure group. The key technical point needed to patch up the Álvarez classes of all strata together is Proposition 4.7, which stablishes that the Álvarez class of a singular stratum S is induced by the Álvarez class of a tube along S. As a consequence, although taut and non-taut strata may coexist in an SRF (as it happens in Example 6.9), all strata below a taut stratum must be taut. As an application, we retrieve a singular version of the classical result by E. Ghys referred to above:

Corollary 1.2. *Every SRF on a compact simply connected manifold X is cohomologically taut.*

Organization of the article. In Sections 2 and 3 we recall some known facts about SRFs and CERFs, respectively, and prove that certain bundles of singular strata are CERFs. In Section 4 we introduce the notion of thick foliated bundle and study the interplay between the Álvarez classes of their components. We apply this study in Section 5, as thick foliated bundles appear in the local structure of an SRF, which we shall use to prove the main results in Section 6. The Appendix is devoted to the reduction of the structure group of the sphere bundle of a stratum.

2. Singular Riemannian Foliations

In this section we present the class of foliations we are going to study in this paper, which were introduced by P. Molino in [Mol88, Chapter 6]. They are essentially Riemannian foliations whose leaves may have different dimensions.

2.1. **SRFs.** A *Singular Riemannian Foliation* (SRF, for short) on a connected manifold X is a partition $\mathcal{K}$ by connected immersed submanifolds, called *leaves*, verifying the following properties:

i) the module of smooth vector fields tangent to the leaves is transitive on each leaf;
ii) there exists a Riemannian metric μ on X, called *adapted metric*, such that each geodesic that is perpendicular at one point to a leaf remains perpendicular to every leaf it meets.

The first condition implies that $(X, \mathcal{K})$ is a singular foliation in the sense of [Ste74] and [Sus73]. Notice that the restriction of $\mathcal{K}$ to a saturated open subset $V \subset X$ induces an SRF in V, which we shall denote by $\mathcal{K}_V$. Any regular Riemannian foliation (RF for short) is an SRF, but the first interesting examples of SRFs are the following:

- the partition defined by the orbits of an action by isometries of a connected Lie group;
- the partition defined by the closures of the leaves of a regular Riemannian foliation.

2.2. **Stratification.** Let L_i denote the union of all the leaves of $\mathcal{K}$ of dimension i. We denote by $\mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K}$ the stratification of X whose elements, called *strata*, are the connected components of the subsets L_i, for every $i \geq 0$. The restriction of $\mathcal{K}$ to a stratum S is an RF $\mathcal{K}_S$. The strata are partially ordered by: $S_1 \preccurlyeq S_2 \Leftrightarrow S_1 \subset \overline{S_2}$. Denote by $\prec$ the corresponding strict partial order. For every stratum S, we have $\overline{S} = \bigcup_{S_i \preccurlyeq S} S_i$. Thus, the minimal strata are the only closed strata. The maximal stratum, called the *regular stratum*, is an open dense subset of X, and shall be denoted by R. The other strata will be called *singular strata*. Recall that two strata S and S' are *comparable* if either $S' \preccurlyeq S$ or $S \preccurlyeq S'$ holds.

The *depth* of a stratum $S \in \mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K}$, written $\operatorname{depth}_\mathcal{K} S$, is defined to be the largest i for which there exists a chain of strata $S_i \prec S_{i-1} \prec \cdots \prec S_0 = S$. So, $\operatorname{depth}_\mathcal{K} S = 0$ if and only if S is a closed stratum. The depth of $\mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K}$ is defined as the depth of its regular stratum, and will be denoted by $\operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K}$. Notice that $\operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K} = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{K}$ is regular.

We now recall some geometrical tools which we shall use for the study of the SRF $(X, \mathcal{K})$.

2.3. **Foliated tubular neighborhoods.** Since a singular stratum $S \in \mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K}$ is a proper submanifold of X, we can consider a tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{T}_S = (T_S, \tau_S, S)$ with fibre the open disk $\mathbb{D}^{n_S+1}$. The following smooth maps are associated with this neighborhood:

- The *radius map* $\rho_S \colon T_S \to [0,1)$ defined fiberwise by $z \mapsto |z|$. Each $t \neq 0$ is a regular value of ρ_S, and we have $\rho_S^{-1}(0) = S$.
- The *contraction* $H_S \colon T_S \times [0,1] \to T_S$ defined fiberwise by $(z, r) \mapsto r \cdot z$. The restriction $(H_S)_t \colon T_S \to T_S$ is an embedding for each $t \neq 0$ and $(H_S)_0 \equiv \tau_S$.

These maps verify $\rho_S(r \cdot u) = r\rho_S(u)$. This tubular neighborhood can be chosen to verify the two following important properties (see [Mol88, Lemma 6.1] and [BM93, Lemme 1]

- Each $(\rho_S^{-1}(t), \mathcal{K})$ is an SRF, and
- Each $(H_S)_t \colon (T_S, \mathcal{K}) \to (T_S, \mathcal{K})$ is a foliated map.

We shall say that $\mathcal{T}_S$ is a *foliated tubular neighborhood* of S. The *core* of $\mathcal{T}_S$ is the hypersurface $D_S = \rho_S^{-1}(1/2)$. The following map

$$\mathscr{L}_S \colon (D_S \times (0,1), \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{I}) \to ((T_S \backslash S), \mathcal{K}), \tag{2.1}$$

defined by $\mathscr{L}_S(z,t) = H_S(z, 2t)$, is a foliated diffeomorphism, where $\mathcal{I}$ stands for the foliation of $(0,1)$ by points.

2.4. **Thom–Mather System.** In Section 5 we shall need the foliated tubular neighborhoods of the strata satisfying certain compatibility conditions. We introduce the following notion, inspired by the abstract stratified objects of [Mat12, Tho69].

A family of foliated tubular neighborhoods $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathcal{T}_S \mid S \text{ singular stratum}\}$ is a *foliated Thom–Mather system* of $(X, \mathcal{K})$ if the following conditions are verified

(TM1) For each pair of singular strata S, S' we have

$$T_S \cap T_{S'} \neq \emptyset \Longleftrightarrow S \text{ and } S' \text{ are comparable.}$$

Let us suppose that $S' \prec S$. The other conditions are:

(TM2) $T_S \cap T_{S'} = \tau_S^{-1}(T_{S'} \cap S)$.
(TM3) $\rho_{S'} = \rho_{S'} \circ \tau_S$ on $T_S \cap T_{S'}$.
(TM4) $\rho_S \circ (H_{S'})_t = \rho_S$, and $\rho_{S'} \circ (H_S)_t = \rho_{S'}$ on $T_S \cap T_{S'}$, for all $t \in (0, 1)$.

This notion was already defined in [RPSAW08, Appendix], but without the condition (TM4). In that paper we constructed a collection of tubular neighborhoods $\mathcal{T}$ satisfying (TM1), (TM2) and (TM3). Let's show that, in turn, it also satisfies the condition (TM4).

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF defined on a compact manifold X. Then there exists a foliated Thom–Mather system of $(X, \mathcal{K})$.*

Proof. Consider the collection $\mathcal{T}$ of foliated tubular neighborhoods constructed in [RPSAW08, Appendix], where it is proven to satisfy (TM1), (TM2) and (TM3). Let's see (TM4).

Consider two singular strata $S' \prec S$. For every $(y, t) \in T_S \cap T_{S'} \times (0, 1)$, we have

$$\rho_{S'} \circ (H_S)_t(y) \overset{(TM3)}{=} \rho_{S'} \circ \tau_S (H_S)_t(y) = \rho_{S'}(y),$$

and so, the latter part of (TM4) follows.

To prove the first part of (TM4) we recall the description of $T_S \cap T_{S'}$ shown in [RPSAW08, 3.2]. Consider the SRF $(D_{S'}, \mathcal{K}_{D_{S'}})$ and notice that $S'' = D_{S'} \cap S$ is a stratum of that SRF. The following restriction of $\mathscr{L}_{S'}$ (2.1) is, in fact, an isometry:

$$\mathscr{L}_{S'} \colon (D_{S'} \cap T_S \times (0, 1), \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{I}, \mu|_{D_{S'}} + dt^2) \longrightarrow ((T_{S'} \cap T_S), \mathcal{K}, \mu), \tag{2.2}$$

Using $\mu_{D_{S'}}$ we can take a foliated tubular neighbourhood $(T_{S''}, \tau_{S''}, S'')$ of S'' in $D_{S'} \cap T_S$ (see Figure 1). In fact, $T_{S''} = D_{S'} \cap T_S$.

Now, to prove the first part of (TM4), take $y \in T_{S'} \cap T_S$ and $(x, r) \in T_{S''} \times (0, 1)$ such that $\mathscr{L}_{S'}(x, r) = y$. On one hand, notice that (2.2) implies that $\rho_S(\mathscr{L}_{S'}(x, r)) = \rho_{S''}(x)$ for any r, and thus, we have $\rho_S(y) = \rho_{S''}(x)$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_S \circ (H_{S'})_t(y) &= \rho_S \circ (H_{S'})_t(\mathscr{L}_{S'}(x, r)) = \rho_S \circ (H_{S'})_t(H_{S'}(x, 2r)) \\ &= \rho_S\left(H_{S'}(x, 2rt)\right) = \rho_S\left(\mathscr{L}_{S'}(x, rt)\right) = \rho_{S''}(x), \end{aligned}$$

and (TM4) follows.

□

Notice that (TM4) does not hold for $S' = S$ since $\rho_S(H_S(z, r)) = r \cdot \rho_S(z)$. We fix for the rest of this paper a such foliated Thom–Mather system $\mathcal{T}$.

Remark 2.2. Given two singular strata S and S', using (TM1) and (TM4), we have:

$$T_S \cap T_{S'} \neq \emptyset \Longleftrightarrow D_S \cap T_{S'} \neq \emptyset \Longleftrightarrow D_S \cap D_{S'} \neq \emptyset \Longleftrightarrow S \text{ and } S' \text{ are comparable.}$$

2.5. **Structure group.** We can take an atlas of the bundle $\mathcal{T}_S$ whose cocycle takes values in the structure group $\mathrm{O}(n_S+1)$. By [Mol88], we have that the fibers of this bundle are modelled on an SRF $\mathcal{E}_S$ on the open disk $\mathbb{D}^{n_S+1}$. Moreover, this foliation is invariant by homotheties and the origin is the only 0-dimensional leaf. This implies that the sphere bundle $\mathcal{D}_S = (\tau_S, D_S, S)$ which is, indeed, a restriction of $\mathcal{T}_S$, satisfies $\operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{K}_{D_S}} = \operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{K}_{T_S}} - 1$.

P. Molino and H. Boualem ([BM93]) prove that there exists a foliated atlas

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ \varphi_i \colon (\tau_S^{-1}(U_i), \mathcal{K}) \to (U_i \times \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1}, \mathcal{K}_S \times \mathcal{E}_S) \right\}_{i\in I}$$

of $\mathcal{T}_S$ whose cocycle takes values in the following structure group

$$\mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{D}^{n_S+1}, \mathcal{E}_S) = \left\{ f \in \mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{D}^{n_S+1}) \;\middle|\; f \text{ preserves } \mathcal{E}_S \text{ and } |f(v)| = |v| \text{ if } v \in \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1} \right\}.$$

We do not know whether this structure group can be reduced to the compact Lie group $\mathrm{O}(n_S+1) \cap \mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{D}^{n_S+1}, \mathcal{E}_S)$, but the following lemma shows that the sphere bundle $\mathcal{D}_S$ has a richer structure group than that of $\mathcal{T}_S$.

Lemma 2.3. *The sphere bundle $\mathcal{D}_S$ admits an atlas with values in the compact Lie group*

$$\mathrm{O}(n_S+1, \mathcal{G}_S) = \{ A \in \mathrm{O}(n_S+1) \mid A \text{ preserves } \mathcal{G}_S \},$$

where $\mathcal{G}_S$ is an SRF on the fiber $\mathbb{S}^{n_S}$ with no 0-dimensional leaves.

Proof. See Appendix □

3. Tautness of Riemannian Foliations

In this section we recall that, although a stratum S of an SRF $\mathcal{K}$ is, in general, not compact, the tautness of $\mathcal{K}_S$ can be characterized cohomologically. More precisely, the classical study of tautness applies to a class of RF on possibly non-compact manifolds called CERFs, and $\mathcal{K}_S$ is a CERF.



Figure 1. The shaded area is $T_{S'} \cap T_S \cong T_{S''} \times (0,1)$

3.1. **Differential forms.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an oriented foliation of dimension p on the Riemannian manifold (M,μ). The characteristic form $\chi_\mu \in \Omega^p(M)$ is defined by

$$\chi_\mu(X_1,\dots,X_p) = \det(\mu(X_i,E_j)_{ij}) \ , \quad \forall X_1,\dots,X_p \in C^\infty(TM) \ , \tag{3.1}$$

where $\{E_1,\dots,E_p\}$ is a local oriented orthonormal frame of $T\mathcal{F}$. The mean curvature form $\kappa_\mu \in \Omega^1(M)$ is determined by $\kappa_\mu(X) = 0$ for all $X \in C^\infty(T\mathcal{F})$ and Rummler's formula [Rum79]:

$$\kappa_\mu(Y) = -d\chi_\mu(Y,E_1,\dots,E_p) \ , \quad \forall Y \in C^\infty((T\mathcal{F})^{\perp\mu}) \ . \tag{3.2}$$

Notice that both χ_μ and κ_μ are determined by the orthogonal subbundle $(T\mathcal{F})^{\perp\mu}$ and the metric along the leaves. Notice also that κ_μ is defined even if no orientation assumptions are made, and it is determined by (3.2) in an open set where orientation conditions are satisfied.

We say that μ is *taut* (it is also called minimal or harmonic in the literature) if every leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ is a minimal submanifold of M, which is tantamount to saying that its mean curvature form is zero. We shall say that $\mathcal{F}$ is *taut* if M admits a taut metric with respect to $\mathcal{F}$. If $T\mathcal{F}$ is oriented, tautness is characterized by *Rummler-Sullivan's criterion* [Sul79, Remark in p. 219], which says that $\mathcal{F}$ is taut if and only if there exists a form $\omega \in \Omega^p(M)$ whose restriction to $T\mathcal{F}$ is positive and such that it is $d\mathcal{F}$-closed; namely, $d\omega(X_1,\dots,X_p,Y) = 0$ for any vector fields $X_1,\dots,X_p \in C^\infty(T\mathcal{F})$ and $Y \in C^\infty(TM)$.

We say that μ is *tense* if its mean curvature form is basic. We shall say that a tense metric μ is *strongly tense* if κ_μ is also closed (see [NRP14, Def. 2.4]; in [RPSAW08] and [RPSAW09] it is called a *D-metric*).

If $\mathcal{F}$ is an RF on a compact manifold M, then there exists a tense metric ([Dom98, Tenseness Theorem in p. 1239]). As M is compact, any tense metric must also be strongly tense by [KT83, Eq.4.4].

Strong tenseness is not guaranteed if M is not compact. Example 2.4 of [CE97] shows an RF of dimension 2 on a noncompact manifold with a tense metric that is not strongly tense. Nevertheless, in [NRP14, Theorem 1.1] it is shown that any transversely complete RF of dimension 1 on a possibly non-compact manifold M admits a strongly tense metric. In [Noz12, Corollary 1.9] the result is extended to any uniform complete RF.

3.2. **The CERFs.** Let M be a manifold endowed with an RF $\mathcal{F}$. A *zipper* of $\mathcal{F}$ is a compact manifold N endowed with an RF $\mathcal{H}$ verifying the following property:

(a) The manifold M is a saturated open subset of N and $\mathcal{H}_M = \mathcal{F}$.

A *reppiz* of $\mathcal{F}$ is a saturated open subset U of M verifying the following properties:

(b) the closure $\overline{U}$ in M is compact;
(c) the inclusion $U \hookrightarrow M$ induces the isomorphism $H^*(U/\mathcal{F}) \cong H^*(M/\mathcal{F})$,

where $H^*(M/\mathcal{F})$ stands for the *basic cohomology*, that is, the cohomology of the complex of basic forms $\Omega^*(M/\mathcal{F}) = \{\,\omega \in \Omega^*(M) \mid i_X\omega = i_X d\omega = 0 \ \forall X \in C^\infty(T\mathcal{F})\,\}$. We shall also use the notation $U \overset{q.i.}{\hookrightarrow} M$ to denote a quasi-isomorphism in basic cohomology.

We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is a C*ompactly* E*mbeddable* R*iemannian* F*oliation* (or CERF) if $(M,\mathcal{F})$ admits a zipper and a reppiz. We have shown in [RPSAW09, Proposition 2.4] that, for any stratum S of an SRF $\mathcal{K}$ defined on a compact manifold, the foliation $\mathcal{K}_S$ is a CERF.

3.3. **Tautness of CERFs.** In [RPSAW09, section 3] we prove that for a CERF $\mathcal{F}$ on a possibly non-compact manifold M the classical study of cohomology and tautness holds. We summarize the main results here:

(i) The CERF $\mathcal{F}$ admits a strongly tense metric μ.
(ii) The class $[\kappa_\mu] \in H^1(M/\mathcal{F})$ does not depend on the choice of the strongly tense metric μ. We shall call it the *Álvarez class* of $\mathcal{F}$, and denote it by $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathcal{F}}$.
(iii) If U is a saturated open subset of M, then the Álvarez class of $(U, \mathcal{F})$ is the restriction of the Álvarez class of $(M, \mathcal{F})$.
(iv) The tautness of $\mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to any of the following statements:
  (a) $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$,
  (b) $H^n(M/\mathcal{F}) \neq 0$ (when $\mathcal{F}$ is transversally oriented).
  (c) $H^0_\kappa(M/\mathcal{F}) \neq 0$ (when M is oriented and $\mathcal{F}$ is transversally oriented),

where $n = \operatorname{codim} \mathcal{F}$ and the κ-twisted cohomology $H^*_\kappa(M/\mathcal{F})$ is the cohomology of the complex of basic forms with the twisted differential $d_\kappa\omega = d\omega - \kappa \wedge \omega$, being $\kappa \in \Omega^1(M/\mathcal{F})$ any representative of the Álvarez class of $\mathcal{F}$.

4. Thick foliated bundles

In this section we slightly generalize the notion of a foliated bundle. Principal foliated bundles were introduced by Molino (see [Mol88, section 2.6]) to study objects such as the lifted foliation to the transverse frames bundle (see [Mol88, Proposition 2.4]). In such bundles, if a vector is tangent to a leaf, then it cannot be tangent to the fiber of the bundle The fibers of a thick foliated bundle may carry a richer foliated structure. All foliations considered in this section are regular, unless otherwise stated.

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathscr{B}$, $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{E}$ be foliations on the manifolds B, F and E, respectively. A fibre bundle $\pi\colon (E, \mathscr{E}) \longrightarrow (B, \mathscr{B})$ with fiber $(F, \mathscr{F})$ and structure group G is a *thick foliated bundle* if $G \leq \operatorname{Diff}(F, \mathscr{F})$ and there exists an atlas of the bundle $\{(U_i, \psi_i)\}_{i\in I}$ such that the charts

$$\psi_i\colon \left(\pi^{-1}(U_i), \mathscr{E}\right) \longrightarrow (U_i \times F, \mathscr{B} \times \mathscr{F})$$

are foliated diffeomorphisms.

Example 4.2. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF over a compact space X and $\pi\colon D_S \longrightarrow S$ be the sphere bundle of a singular stratum S, for some Thom–Mather system. The restriction of π to the regular part $E = D_S \cap R$ is a thick foliated bundle over $B = S$ whose fiber is the regular part of the model SRF on a sphere (see section 2.5). The foliations $\mathscr{E}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ are the corresponding restrictions of $\mathcal{K}$.

Examples 4.3. The following classical structures are particular cases of thick foliated bundles:

(i) If $G = F$, π is principal and $\mathscr{F}$ is the pointwise foliation, then π is a principal foliated bundle.
(ii) If $\mathscr{B}$ is the one leaf foliation and $\mathscr{F}$ is the pointwise foliation, then π is a foliated bundle in the sense of [Hae73].
(iii) If $\mathscr{B}$ is the pointwise foliation, F is compact and $\mathscr{F}$ is the one leaf foliation, then π is a Seifert bundle.

If $\pi\colon (E,\mathscr{E}) \longrightarrow (B,\mathscr{B})$ is a thick foliated bundle of fiber $(F,\mathscr{F})$, the condition $G \leq \mathrm{Diff}\,(F,\mathscr{F})$ allows us to define a fiberwise foliation $\mathscr{H}$ on E, just considering

$$\psi_i\colon \left(\pi^{-1}(U_i),\mathscr{H}\right) \longrightarrow (U_i \times F, \{\text{points}\} \times \mathscr{F}) \tag{4.1}$$

as foliated diffeomorphisms. We will say that $\mathscr{H}$ is the *fiberwise foliation* associated to π. The following Lemma shows the interplay between the mean curvature forms of the foliations involved in a thick foliation bundle. The proof is similar to the first part of the proof of [Noz10, Lemma 7].

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\pi\colon (E,\mathscr{E}) \longrightarrow (B,\mathscr{B})$ be a thick foliated bundle. Let γ be a metric on E and denote by κ_γ the mean curvature form of $(E,\mathscr{H},\gamma)$, where $\mathscr{H}$ is the associated fiberwise foliation. Then for any metric μ_B on B, there exists a metric μ_E on E such that the mean curvature form of $(E,\mathscr{E},\mu_E)$ is*

$$\kappa_{\mu_E} = (\kappa_\gamma)_{0,1} + \pi^*\kappa_{\mu_B}, \tag{4.2}$$

where the bigrading is associated to $TE = T\mathscr{E} \oplus (T\mathscr{E})^{\perp\gamma}$.

Proof. We consider a bundle decomposition

$$TE = \underbrace{\zeta_1 \oplus \overbrace{T\mathscr{H}}^{T\mathscr{E}} \oplus \zeta_2}_{\ker \pi_*} \oplus \zeta_3 \quad \text{satisfying} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{(i)} & \ker\pi_* = \zeta_1 \oplus T\mathscr{H}; \\ \text{(ii)} & T\mathscr{E} = T\mathscr{H} \oplus \zeta_2; \\ \text{(iii)} & \zeta_1 \oplus \zeta_3 \leq (T\mathscr{H})^{\perp\gamma}; \\ \text{(iv)} & \pi_*|_{\zeta_2}\colon \zeta_2 \longrightarrow T\mathscr{B} \text{ is an isomorphism;} \\ \text{(v)} & \pi_*|_{\zeta_3}\colon \zeta_3 \longrightarrow (T\mathscr{B})^{\perp\mu_B} \text{ is an isomorphism.} \end{array}$$

To construct such a decomposition, first, take $\zeta_1 = (T\mathscr{H})^{\perp\gamma} \cap \ker\pi_*$, which gives (i). Take ζ_2 any supplementary of $T\mathscr{H}$ in $T\mathscr{E}$, thus satisfying (ii). As $\pi_*\colon T\mathscr{E} \to T\mathscr{B}$ is surjective and $T\mathscr{H} \leq \ker\pi_*$, for degree reasons we have (iv). Now, consider D a supplementary of ζ_1 in $(T\mathscr{H})^{\perp\gamma}$. Notice that $\pi_*|_D\colon D \to TB$ is an isomorphism. Finally, we take $\zeta_3 = (\pi_*|_D)^{-1}((T\mathscr{B})^{\perp\mu_B})$, which gives (iii) and (v).

Now, we define the metric $\mu_E = \gamma|_{\ker\pi_*} + \pi^*\mu_B$ so that the four summands of the previous decomposition are μ_E-orthogonal. To prove formula (4.2) it suffices to check it locally; namely, for any neighbourhood $U \subset E$ small enough so that both $\mathscr{H}_U$ and $\mathscr{E}_U$ are oriented (and thus, $\mathscr{B}_{\pi(U)}$). We now claim that, in U, we have

$$\chi_{\mu_E} = \chi_\gamma \wedge \pi^*\chi_{\mu_B}, \tag{4.3}$$

where χ_γ is the characteristic form of $(M,\mathscr{H},\gamma)$. By definition (see 3.1) χ_{μ_E} is the form that vanishes when applied to any vector orthogonal to $\mathscr{E}$ and whose restriction to its leaves is a volume form of norm one.

So consider a γ-orthonormal and positively oriented parallelism $X_1,\dots,X_p$ of $T\mathscr{H}_U$ and a μ_U-orthonormal and positively oriented parallelism $Z_1,\dots,Z_q$ of $T\mathscr{B}|_{\pi(U)}$, which are π_*-related to the μ_B-orthonormal parallelism $Y_1,\dots,Y_q$ of $\zeta_2|_U$. As $\pi_*(X_i) = 0$ for $i = 1,\dots,p$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}(\chi_\gamma \wedge \pi^*\chi_{\mu_B})(X_1,\dots,X_p,Y_1,\dots,Y_q) &= \chi_\gamma(X_1,\dots,X_p)\pi^*\chi_{\mu_B}(Y_1,\dots,Y_q) \\ &= \chi_S(Z_1,\dots,Z_q) = 1 = \chi_{\mu_E}(X_1,\dots,X_p,Y_1,\dots,Y_q).\end{aligned}$$

Now, take Y a section of $(T\mathscr{E})^{\perp\mu_E}|_U = \zeta_1|_U \oplus \zeta_3|_U$. By (iii), we have $Y \in C^\infty(T\mathscr{H}^{\perp\gamma})$, and thus, $i_Y\chi_\gamma = 0$. We also have $i_Y(\pi^*\chi_B) = 0$, because $\pi_*(Y) \in C^\infty((T\mathscr{B})^{\perp\mu_B}|_{\pi(U)})$ (due to (iii) and (v)). So (4.3) follows.

To prove (4.2), first take X a section of $T\mathscr{E} \overset{\text{(ii)}}{=} T\mathscr{H} \oplus \zeta_2$. We have $\pi^*(\kappa_{\mu_B})(X) = 0$, because $\pi_*(X) \in C^\infty(T\mathscr{B})$, and $(\kappa_\gamma)_{0,1}(X) = 0$ because of the bigrading. So (4.2) holds for $T\mathscr{E}$.

It remains to check (4.2) for Y a section of $(T\mathscr{E})^{\perp\mu_E}|_U = \zeta_1|_U \oplus \zeta_3|_U$. Notice that $\pi_*Y \in C^\infty((T\mathscr{B})^{\perp\mu_B})$ and $Y \in C^\infty((T\mathscr{H})^{\perp\gamma})$. So we finally have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{\mu_E}(Y) &\overset{(3.2)}{=} -d\chi_{\mu_E}(Y, X_1, \dots, X_p, Y_1, \dots, Y_q) \\
&\overset{(4.3)}{=} -d\chi_\gamma(Y, X_1, \dots, X_p)\underbrace{\pi^*\chi_{\mu_B}(Y_1, \dots, Y_q)}_{=1} - \underbrace{\chi_\gamma(X_1, \dots, X_p)}_{=1}\pi^*d\chi_{\mu_B}(Y, Y_1, \dots, Y_q) \\
&\overset{(3.2)}{=} \kappa_\gamma(Y) + \pi^*\kappa_{\mu_B}(Y) = (\kappa_\gamma)_{0,1}(Y) + \pi^*\kappa_{\mu_B}(Y). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the following Lemma is partially similar to that of [Ghy84, Theorem 3.1]:

Lemma 4.5. *The fiberwise foliation associated to a thick foliated bundle with taut fibre and compact structure group is taut.*

Proof. In [AL92, Lemma 6.3] it is proven that the tautness character of a foliation is preserved by finite coverings (that result is stablished for Riemannian foliations on compact manifolds, but the proof does not use those assumptions). So by Lemma 4.6, we can assume that the fibre $(F, \mathscr{F})$ is oriented and that the structure group G belongs to $\mathrm{Diff}^+(F, \mathscr{F})$ (the group of diffeomorphisms of F preserving a given orientation on $T\mathscr{F}$) to prove that $\mathscr{H}$ is taut.

Take $\chi \in \Omega^p(F)$ a $d\mathscr{F}$-closed characteristic form, and consider its averaged form

$$\overline{\chi} = \int_G g^*\chi \; dg \in \Omega^p(F),$$

where $p = \dim \mathscr{F}$. We have that $\overline{\chi}$ is also $d\mathscr{F}$-closed because the elements of G preserve $\mathscr{F}$. As they also preserve the orientation of $T\mathscr{F}$, then the restriction $\overline{\chi}|_{T\mathscr{F}}$ is positive.

We can take $\{(U_i, \psi_i)\}_{i\in I}$ an atlas of the thick fibre bundle π whose cocycle belongs to G, and a partition of unity $\{(U_i, \rho_i)\}_{i\in I}$. For all $i \in I$, define ϕ_i and r_i so that the following diagrams are commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
[0,1] & \xleftarrow{r_i} & \pi^{-1}(U_i) & & \\
\uparrow{\scriptstyle \rho_i} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi_i} & \searrow^{\phi_i} & \\
U_i & \xleftarrow[p_i]{} & U_i \times F & \xrightarrow[(p_F)_i]{} & F
\end{array}$$

where p_i and $(p_F)_i$ are the projections onto each factor. Now, we define

$$\chi = \sum_i r_i \cdot \phi_i^*\overline{\chi} \in \Omega^p(E),$$

being E the total space of the thick fibre bundle. We now prove that the associated fiberwise foliation $\mathscr{H}$ is taut by showing that χ satisfies the conditions of the Rummler-Sullivan criterion. First, we have that $\chi|_{T\mathscr{H}}$ is positive because $\overline{\chi}|_{T\mathscr{F}}$ is positive and the maps $\phi_i\colon (\pi^{-1}(U_i),\mathscr{H}) \to (F,\mathscr{F})$ are foliated (see (4.1)). It remains to see that χ is $d\mathscr{H}$-closed. Take $X_1,\dots,X_p \in C^\infty(T\mathscr{H})$ and $Y \in C^\infty(TE)$. On one hand, for all $i \in I$ and $j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, we have

$$dr_i(X_j) = X_j(r_i) = X_j(\rho_i \circ p_i \circ \psi_i) = 0, \tag{4.4}$$

because $\rho_i \circ p_i \circ \psi_i$ is constant along the leaves of $\mathscr{H}$. On the other hand, for all $i,j \in I$, we have that $\phi_i^*\overline{\chi} = \phi_j^*\overline{\chi}$, because $\phi_j \circ \phi_i^{-1} \in G$ and $\overline{\chi}$ is G-invariant. Thus, fixing $i_0 \in I$, we have

$$\sum_{i\in I} dr_i(Y)\phi_i^*\overline{\chi}(X_1,\dots,X_p) = \phi_{i_0}^*\overline{\chi}(X_1,\dots,X_p)\sum_{i\in I} dr_i(Y) = 0, \tag{4.5}$$

because $\sum_{i\in I} dr_i(Y) = d\big(\sum_{i\in I} r_i\big)(Y) = d(1)(Y) = 0$. Now, (4.4) and (4.5) yield

$$\sum_{i\in I} dr_i \wedge \phi_i^*\overline{\chi}(X_1,\dots,X_p,Y) = 0,$$

which, finally, leads to

$$d\chi(X_1,\dots,X_p,Y) = \sum_{i\in I} r_i \cdot d\overline{\chi}(\phi_{i*}X_1,\dots,\phi_{i*}X_p,\phi_{i*}Y) = 0,$$

because $\overline{\chi}$ is $d\mathscr{F}$-closed and $\phi_{i*}X_j \in C^\infty(T\mathscr{F})$ for all $i \in I$ and $j = 1,\dots,p$. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\pi\colon (E,\mathscr{E}) \longrightarrow (B,\mathscr{B})$ be a thick foliated bundle with taut fibre $(F,\mathscr{F})$ and compact structure group. Then there exists a foliated finite covering map $\tau\colon (E_1,\mathscr{E}_1) \to (E,\mathscr{E})$ such that $\pi_1 = \pi\circ\tau$ is a thick foliated bundle whose fiber $(F_1,\mathscr{F}_1)$ is taut and oriented, admitting a compact structure group $G_1 \leq \mathrm{Diff}^+(F_1,\mathscr{F}_1)$.*

Proof. It is easy to construct a finite covering $\tau\colon (F_1,\mathscr{F}_1) \longrightarrow (F,\mathscr{F})$, being $\mathscr{F}_1$ oriented and transversally oriented, which implies F_1 oriented. We can construct a new fiber bundle using the same cocycle. The new structure group G_1 is still compact, as it is a subgroup of $G\times\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2$, and preserves the orientation of $\mathscr{F}_1$. As the covering τ is finite, we have that $\mathscr{F}$ is taut if and only if $\mathscr{F}_1$ is taut. □

Proposition 4.7. *Let $\pi\colon (E,\mathscr{E}) \longrightarrow (B,\mathscr{B})$ be a thick foliated bundle of CERFs with taut fibre and compact structure group. Then the Álvarez classes of $\mathscr{E}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ satisfy*

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathscr{E}} = \pi^*\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathscr{B}}.$$

Proof. The associated fiberwise foliation $\mathscr{H}$ is taut by Lemma 4.5. Take γ a taut metric on $(E,\mathscr{H})$, that is, satisfying $\kappa_\gamma = 0$, and take μ_B a strongly tense metric on $(B,\mathscr{B})$. By Lemma 4.4, we get a metric μ_E such that $\kappa_{\mu_E} = \pi^*\kappa_{\mu_B}$. Notice that κ_{μ_E} is a closed $\mathscr{E}$-basic form, and thus, μ_E is strongly tense. By 3.3(ii), we get $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathscr{E}} = \pi^*\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathscr{B}}$. □

We finish this section with two illustrations of Proposition 4.7.

Remark 4.8. Denote by $\pi\colon (M^1, \mathcal{F}^1) \longrightarrow (M, \mathcal{F})$ the transverse orthonormal frame bundle of the RF $(M, \mathcal{F})$. Then π is a thick foliated principal bundle. The fiber $O(q)$ carries the pointwise foliation, which is trivially taut. Then by Proposition 4.7 we get that their Álvarez classes satisfy $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathcal{F}_1} = \pi^* \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathcal{F}}$. This result was proven in [Noz10, Lemma 7] without using Domínguez's Theorem. This remark applies for any other foliated principal bundle with compact structure group.

Corollary 4.9. *Let G_1 and G_2 be Lie groups acting on M, so that the actions commute and originate CERFs $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ on M, respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the foliation induced on M by the diagonal action of $G_1 \times G_2$ and by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2$ the foliation induced by G_2 on M/G_1, and suppose that those foliations are also CERFs. Then if $(M, \mathcal{F}_1)$ is taut, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *$(M, \mathcal{F})$ is taut;*
(ii) *$(M, \mathcal{F}_2)$ is taut;*
(iii) *$(M/G_1, \tilde{F}_2)$ is taut.*

Proof. Let's see (i)⇔(ii). On one hand, the bundle $\pi_1\colon (M, \mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow (M/G_1, \tilde{F}_2)$ is a thick foliated bundle whose fiberwise foliation is F_1. Notice that as it is taut, then the compacity of the structure group (G_1) can be dropped in the hypothesis of Proposition 4.7.

Let's see (i)⇔(ii). The bundle $\pi_1\colon (M, \mathcal{F}_1) \longrightarrow (M/G_1, \tilde{F}_2)$ is another thick foliated bundle with pointwisely foliated fibre G_2. Notice that the compacity of the structure group G_2 can also be dropped in the hypothesis of Proposition 4.7 because the pointwise foliation (which is the fiberwise foliation in this case) is taut.

□

5. Local structure of SRFs

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF on the compact manifold X. In this section we prove that the Álvarez class of a stratum of $\mathcal{K}$ induces the Álvarez class of its corresponding sphere bundle, which will be a key step to extend the Álvarez class to the whole manifold X in the next section.

We first show that the regular part of the sphere bundle of a singular stratum is a CERF. Recall the quasi-isomorphism notation used in 3.2 (c).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(Y, \mathcal{K})$ be an SRF with a foliated Thom–Mather system. Consider S and S' two singular strata and take $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Consider $M = D_S \cap R$ the regular part of the sphere bundle D_S, and the subset $M_\varepsilon = M \backslash \rho_{S'}^{-1}([0, \varepsilon])$. Then we have $M_\varepsilon \overset{\text{q.i.}}{\hookrightarrow} M$.*

Proof. First notice that if $S = S'$, then $M \subset D_S \subset \rho_S^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})$, and hence, $M = M_\epsilon$. If S and S' are not comparable, then by Remark 2.2 we also have $M = M_\epsilon$. So in both cases, the lemma follows trivially.

Suppose that either $S \prec S'$ or $S' \prec S$ holds. The restriction of the map (2.1)

$$\mathscr{L}_{S'}\colon (D_{S'} \times (0,1), \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{I}) \to ((T_{S'} \backslash S'), \mathcal{K}),$$

to the regular part is the foliated diffeomorphism:

$$\mathscr{L}_{S'}\colon (D_{S'} \cap R \times (0,1), \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{I}) \longrightarrow ((T_{S'} \cap R), \mathcal{K}). \tag{5.1}$$

We now prove the following identity by double inclusion:

$$\mathscr{L}_{S'}(D_S \cap D_{S'} \cap R \times (0,1)) = D_S \cap T_{S'} \cap R. \tag{5.2}$$

For the $\subseteq$ part, take $x \in D_S \cap D_{S'} \cap R$ and $t \in (0,1)$. Then

$$\rho_S(\mathscr{L}_{S'}(x,t)) = \rho_S(H_{S'}(x,2t)) \overset{(TM4)}{=} \rho_S(x) = 1/2, \tag{5.3}$$

which implies $\mathscr{L}_{S'}(x,t) \in D_S$, and by (5.1), we are done. For the reciprocal, take $x \in D_S \cap T_{S'} \cap R$. As $x \in T_{S'}$, there exists $(y,t) \in D_{S'} \times (0,1)$ such that

$$x = H_{S'}(y,2t) \Rightarrow 1/2 = \rho_S(x) = \rho_S(H_{S'}(y,2t)) \overset{(TM4)}{=} \rho_S(y), \tag{5.4}$$

that is, $y \in D_S$, which proves the $\supseteq$ part.

We now define the covering $M = M_\varepsilon \cup V$, where $V = M \cap T_{S'}$. We have the following chain of foliated diffeomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} M_\varepsilon \cap V = D_S \cap R \cap T_{S'} \cap \rho_{S'}^{-1}((\varepsilon,1)) &\overset{(5.2)}{=} \mathscr{L}_{S'}(D_S \cap D_{S'} \cap R \times (\varepsilon,1)) \\ &\cong D_S \cap D_{S'} \cap R \times (\varepsilon,1) \cong D_S \cap D_{S'} \cap R \times (0,1) \overset{(5.2)}{\cong} D_S \cap R \cap T_{S'} = V, \end{aligned}$$

and thus the Mayer-Vietoris sequence for basic cohomology yields $M_\varepsilon \overset{\text{q.i.}}{\hookrightarrow} M$. □

Remark 5.2. Notice that we need both parts of (TM4) to prove (5.3) and (5.4) because we are considering both cases ($S \prec S'$ and $S' \prec S$).

We now fix some notation for the rest of this article. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we shall write:

- $\Sigma_i = \bigcup_{\operatorname{depth}_{\mathcal{K}} S \leq i} S$

and, for $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$, where $r = \operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{K}}$,

- $T_i = \bigcup_{S \subset \Sigma_i \setminus \Sigma_{i-1}} S$
- $\tau_i \colon T_i \to \Sigma_i \setminus \Sigma_{i-1}$;
- $\rho_i \colon T_i \to [0,1)$ its radius function, and
- $D_i = \rho_i^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})$ the core of T_i.

Notice that both T_i and D_i have a finite number of connected components. The proof of the next Proposition is similar to that of [RPSAW09, Proposition 2.4]:

Proposition 5.3. *Let S be a singular stratum of $\mathcal{K}$, denote by T_S its tubular neighborhood in $\mathcal{T}$ and D_S its corresponding core. Then the restrictions of $\mathcal{K}$ to both $T_S \cap R$ and $D_S \cap R$ are CERFs.*

Proof. The foliated diffeomorphism (5.1) implies that it suffices to show that $(D_S \cap R, \mathcal{K})$ is a CERF to prove the proposition. Notice that any zipper of the CERF $(R, \mathcal{K})$ is a zipper for $(D_S \cap R, \mathcal{K})$, which yields property (a) of 3.2. So it suffices to construct a reppiz of $M = D_S \cap R$ by removing a small neighbourhood of each singular stratum.

Take $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and consider $T_i^\varepsilon = \bigcup_{j=0}^{i} \rho_j^{-1}([0,\varepsilon])$ for all $i = 0, \dots, r-1$. Notice that $X \setminus R = \Sigma_{r-1} \subset T_{r-1}^\varepsilon$. We now show that $U = M \setminus T_{r-1}^\varepsilon$ is a reppiz of M, i.e., U satisfies properties (b) and (c) of 3.2.

We define, for $i = 0, \dots, r-1$:

- the subset $U_i = M \backslash T_i^\varepsilon$;
- the space $Y_i = X \backslash T_i^\varepsilon$.
- the collection $\mathcal{T}_i = \{\, T \backslash T_i^\varepsilon \mid T \in \mathcal{T} \,\}$;
- the statement

  $P_i \equiv$ "$\mathcal{T}_i$ is a foliated Thom–Mather system of the SRF $(Y_i, \mathcal{K})$, and $U_i \overset{\text{q.i.}}{\hookrightarrow} M$."

We now prove P_{r-1} by induction on i, which implies 3.2 (b).

As Σ_0 is a union of minimal (closed) strata of $(X, \mathcal{K})$, then $T_0^\varepsilon = \rho_0^{-1}([0, \varepsilon])$ is a saturated closed subset of $(X, \mathcal{K})$, and the first part of P_0 follows. Now by repeatedly applying Lemma 5.1 with $Y = X$ and S' each connected component of Σ_0, we get the second part, that is, $U_0 \overset{\text{q.i.}}{\hookrightarrow} M$.

Suppose now that P_{i-1} is true, and let's prove P_i. We have

$$Y_i = X \backslash T_i^\varepsilon = Y_{i-1} \backslash \rho_i^{-1}([0, \varepsilon]) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_i = \left\{\, T \backslash \rho_i^{-1}([0, \varepsilon]) \;\middle|\; T \in \mathcal{T}_{i-1} \,\right\}$$

Notice that, for every $S' \in \Sigma_i$ we have that $S' \backslash T_{i-1}^\varepsilon$ is a minimal (hence, closed) stratum of Y_{i-1}. So $\rho_i^{-1}([0, \varepsilon])$ is a saturated closed subset of $(Y_{i-1}, \mathcal{K})$ and as a consequence, we get the first part of P_i. By repeatedly applying Lemma 5.1 with $Y = Y_{i-1}$ and S' each connected component of Σ_i, we get $U_i \overset{\text{q.i.}}{\hookrightarrow} U_{i-1}$. By induction hypothesis, we have $U_{i-1} \overset{\text{q.i.}}{\hookrightarrow} M$, and hence, $U_i \overset{\text{q.i.}}{\hookrightarrow} M$ holds. So we get P_i and the induction proof is completed.

We have proven P_{r-1}, which implies that $U = U_{r-1}$ satisfies 3.2 (b).

We now have to prove that the closure of U in M is compact (property (c) of 3.2).

Consider the union of open tubes $T_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{i=0}^{r-1} (T_i^\varepsilon)^\circ = \bigcup_{i=0}^{r-1} \rho_i^{-1}([0, \varepsilon))$, where $(\cdot)^\circ$ stands for the interior operator. We define $K = M \backslash T_\varepsilon$, which is a subset of M containing U. Let's compute its closure in X:

$$\overline{K} \subset \overline{M} \backslash (T_\varepsilon)^\circ = \overline{M} \backslash T_\varepsilon \overset{(\star)}{=} M \backslash T_\varepsilon = K$$

So K is closed in X, and thus, compact. Hence, U is compact, and 3.2 (b) is satisfied. To justify step $(\star)$, it suffices to see $\overline{(D_S \cap R)} \backslash (D_S \cap R) \subset \Sigma_{r-1}$, because in that case, $\overline{M} \backslash M \subset T_\varepsilon$. By construction, the core D_S is a closed subset of $X \backslash \Sigma_{s-1}$, being $s = \operatorname{depth}_{\mathcal{K}} S$. So we get $\overline{D_S} \backslash D_S \subset \Sigma_{s-1}$ and therefore:

$$\overline{D_S \cap R} \backslash (D_S \cap R) \subset \overline{D_S} \backslash (D_S \cap R) = \overline{D_S} \backslash D_S \cup \overline{D_S} \backslash R \subset \Sigma_{s-1} \cup X \backslash R = \Sigma_{r-1},$$

which ends the proof. □

We get that the Álvarez class of a singular stratum induces that of its sphere bundle.

Proposition 5.4. *Let S be a minimal stratum of an SRF $(X, \mathcal{K})$, and let $\pi \colon D_S \longrightarrow S$ be its associated sphere bundle. Suppose that the foliation of the fibre is taut. Then the Álvarez classes of $\mathcal{K}_{D_S \cap R}$ and $\mathcal{K}_S$ satisfy $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{DS} = \pi^* \boldsymbol{\kappa}_S$.*

Proof. From Proposition 5.3, $\mathcal{K}_{D_S \cap R}$ is a CERF. From Lemma 2.3, π is a thick foliated bundle with compact structure group and taut fiber. Proposition 4.7 gives the result. □

6. Tautness of Singular Riemannian Foliations

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF on the compact connected manifold X. In Proposition 5.4 we proved that the Álvarez class of each stratum is related to that of the regular part of a tube around it. This resembles a lot Verona's approach to differential forms on stratified spaces, cf. [Ver71]. In this section we shall follow that approach to patch up the Álvarez classes of all the strata into a unique cohomology class.

Notice that the definition of the basic forms (see Section 3.2) in the context of a regular foliation makes sense when the foliation is singular. We shall thus use the same notation and denote the *basic cohomology* of $(X, \mathcal{K})$ by $H^*(X/\mathcal{K})$. The existence of basic partitions of unity implies the existence of Mayer-Vietoris sequences for the basic cohomology of open $\mathcal{K}$-saturated subsets of X (see [Wol89, Lemma 3]).

Remark 6.1. By degree reasons, the inclusion $\Omega^1(X/\mathcal{K}) \hookrightarrow \Omega^1(X)$ induces a monomorphism in cohomology $H^1(X/\mathcal{K}) \rightarrowtail H^1(X)$.

The following example will be used in the proof of the main theorem:

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an SRF on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^k$ without 0-dimensional leaves. Then $H^1(\mathbb{S}^k/\mathcal{G}) = 0$.*

Proof. If $k = 1$, since there are no 0-dimensional leaves, $\mathcal{G}$ must be a regular foliation of dimension 1, that is, the one leaf foliation, and the statement holds trivially. If $k \neq 1$, then the lemma follows by Remark 6.1, because $H^1(\mathbb{S}^k) = 0$. □

Assume the notation used in Section 5, and put $r = \operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{K}}$. We have the following compact saturated subsets of X:

$$\emptyset = \Sigma_{-1} \subset \Sigma_0 \subset \cdots \subset \Sigma_{r-1} = X \backslash R \subset \Sigma_r = X.$$

We also consider the open saturated subsets $R_i = X \backslash \Sigma_{r-i}$ and the inclusions

$$\emptyset = R_0 \subset R = R_1 \subset R_2 \subset \cdots \subset R_r \subset R_{r+1} = X.$$

Proposition 6.3. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF on X, and denote by R its regular part. Then the inclusion induces a monomorphism in basic cohomology*

$$\iota_R \colon H^1(X/\mathcal{K}) \rightarrowtail H^1(R/\mathcal{K}).$$

Proof. We consider, for $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r+1\}$ the following statement:

$P_i \equiv$ "The inclusion $R_{i-1} \hookrightarrow R_i$ induces a monomorphism $H^1(R_i/\mathcal{K}) \rightarrowtail H^1(R_{i-1}/\mathcal{K})$".

We shall show that P_i holds for every $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r+1\}$, thus proving the Proposition. P_1 holds trivially. Take, for short, $T = T_{r-i+1}$, which is a tube of the singular strata forming $R_i \backslash R_{i-1}$. From the saturated open covering $\{R_{i-1}, T\}$ of R_i, we have the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence for basic cohomology, which begins:

$$H^0(R_i/\mathcal{K}) \longrightarrow H^0(R_{i-1}/\mathcal{K}) \oplus H^0(T/\mathcal{K}) \longrightarrow H^0((R_{i-1} \cap T)/\mathcal{K}) \longrightarrow \ldots \tag{6.1}$$

By (6.1), $H^0(R_i/\mathcal{K}) \cong H^0(R_{i-1}/\mathcal{K})$ and $H^0(T/\mathcal{K}) \cong H^0((R_{i-1} \cap T)/\mathcal{K})$, we get the exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(R_i/\mathcal{K}) \xrightarrow{\phi} H^1(R_{i-1}/\mathcal{K}) \oplus H^1(T/\mathcal{K}) \xrightarrow{\rho} H^1((R_{i-1} \cap T)/\mathcal{K}). \tag{6.2}$$

If we prove that $H^1(T/\mathcal{K}) \longrightarrow H^1((R_{i-1} \cap T)/\mathcal{K})$ is injective, we get that ϕ is injective and thus P_i. As $R_{i-1} \cap T = T_{r-i+1} \backslash \Sigma_{r-i+1}$, it suffices to prove that, for each singular stratum S, the inclusion $\iota \colon T_S \cap R_{i-1} \hookrightarrow T_S$ induces a monomorphism in basic cohomology. We have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^1(T_S/\mathcal{K}) & \xrightarrow{\iota^*} & H^1((T_S \cap R_{i-1})/\mathcal{K}) \\ {\scriptstyle \tau^*}\uparrow \cong & & {\scriptstyle \iota_D^*}\downarrow \cong \\ H^1(S/\mathcal{K}) & \xrightarrow{\pi *} & H^1(D_S \cap R_{i-1})/\mathcal{K}), \end{array} \tag{6.3}$$

where ι_D is induced by the inclusion $D_S \hookrightarrow T_S$ and $\pi = \tau|_{D_S}$. As ι_D^* is an isomorphism we just have to prove that π^* is injective. Take $[\alpha] \in H^1(S/\mathcal{K})$ so that $\pi^*\alpha = df$, with f a basic function on $D_S \cap R_{i-1}$. As $i_X df = i_X(\pi^*\alpha) = 0 = i_X f$ for every $X \in \ker \pi_*$, we have that f is π-basic, and so there exists $g \in C^\infty(S)$ so that $f = \pi^* g$. Hence $\pi^*(\alpha) = d\pi^* g = \pi^* dg$, which yields $\alpha = dg$, because π is a submersion. By degree reasons, we have that g is $\mathcal{K}$-basic and thus $[\alpha] = [dg] = 0$ in $H^1(S/\mathcal{K})$. We get that π^* is injective, which ends the proof. □

Theorem 1.1 (bis.). *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF on a closed manifold X. Then there exists a unique class $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X \in H^1(X/\mathcal{K})$ that contains the Álvarez class of each stratum. More precisely, the restriction of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X$ to each stratum S is the Álvarez class of $(S, \mathcal{K}_S)$.*

Proof. First notice that the unicity of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X$ comes from the fact that it induces the Álvarez class of the regular part and from Proposition 6.3. For the existence, we proceed by complete induction on $r = \operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K}$. When $r = 0$ the SRF is indeed an RF and the result follows trivially. If $r > 0$, we assume that the theorem is true for $\operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K} < r$ and prove it for $\operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_\mathcal{K} = r$. We shall construct inductively on $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, r+1\}$ a form $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_i \in H^1(R_i/\mathcal{K})$ satisfying

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}_i|_{R_{i-1}} = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{i-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\kappa}_i|_S = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_S \quad \forall S \subset R_i \backslash R_{i-1},$$

and finish the proof by taking $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{r+1}$. Suppose that we have constructed the classes $0 = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_0, \boldsymbol{\kappa}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{i-1}$ and let's construct $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_i$. As in the proof of Proposition 6.3 we take the open covering $\{R_{i-1}, T\}$ of R_i, which yields the exact sequence (6.2). We shall prove that $\rho(\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{i-1}, \tau^*\boldsymbol{\kappa}_S) = 0$ for each singular stratum $S \subset R_i \backslash R_{i-1}$, which would give $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_i$ by the exactness of 6.3, thus completing the induction. By Proposition 6.3, $\iota_i \colon H^1((R_{i-1} \cap T)/\mathcal{K}) \rightarrowtail H^1((T \cap R)/\mathcal{K})$ is a monomorphism. So, if we prove that $\iota_i \circ \rho(\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{i-1}, \tau^*\boldsymbol{\kappa}_S) = 0$, we are done. We have

$$\iota_i \circ \rho(\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{i-1}, \tau^*\kappa_S) = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{i-1}|_{R \cap T} - \tau^*\boldsymbol{\kappa}_S|_{R \cap T} = \cdots = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_R|_{R \cap T} - \tau^*\boldsymbol{\kappa}_S|_{R \cap T}, \tag{6.4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_R$ is the Álvarez class of $R = R_1$. Notice that the nullity of (6.4) can be checked on $H^1(D_S \cap R)/\mathcal{K})$ via the isomorphism ι_D^* of (6.3). There only remains to prove that

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}_R|_{R \cap D_S} = \pi^*\boldsymbol{\kappa}_S \in H^1((D_S \cap R)/\mathcal{K}). \tag{6.5}$$

Let $(\mathbb{S}^{n_S}, \mathcal{G})$ be the fibre of the bundle D_S. Then $\operatorname{depth} \mathcal{G} < r$, and by induction hypothesis, there exists a class $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_\mathbb{S} \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n_S}/\mathcal{G})$ whose restriction to the regular part $R_\mathbb{S}$ of $\mathcal{G}$ is the Álvarez class of $(R_\mathbb{S}, \mathcal{G})$. By Lemma 6.2, we have that $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_\mathbb{S} = 0$, which yields $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{R_\mathbb{S}} = 0$

and thus $(R_{\mathbb{S}}, \mathcal{G})$ is a taut CERF. Then by Proposition 5.4 we get (6.5) and the proof is complete. □

This theorem leads us to the following natural definitions:

Definition 6.4. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF on a compact connected manifold X. Then the *Álvarez class* of $(X, \mathcal{K})$ is the unique class $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X \in H^1(X/\mathcal{K})$ which induces the Álvarez class of every stratum of $\mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{K}}$. We shall say that an SRF is *cohomologically taut* if its Álvarez class is zero.

Notice that although geometrical tautness cannot be achieved globally for an SRF (see 1.1), we have been able to define cohomological tautness by means of a basic class (which may be regarded as a class in $H^1(X)$, by Remark 6.1). The geometrical meaning of the cohomological tautness of an SRF must be interpretated individually on each stratum, as we summarize in the following theorem:

Theorem 6.5. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an SRF on a compact manifold X. Then, the following three statements are equivalent:*
(a) *The foliation $\mathcal{K}$ is cohomologically taut;*
(b) *The foliation $\mathcal{K}_S$ is taut for each stratum $S \in \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{K}}$;*
(c) *The foliation $\mathcal{K}_R$ is taut.*

Proof. The only nontrivial implication is (c) $\Longrightarrow$ (a), which follows because $\iota_R(\kappa_X) = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_R = 0$ and Proposition 6.3. □

The following Corollary generalizes E. Ghys' celebrated result about tautness of Riemannian foliations on simply connected spaces (see [Ghy84, Théorème B]:

Corollary 1.2 (bis.). *Every SRF on a compact simply connected manifold X is cohomologically taut.*

Proof. By Remark 6.1 we have $H^1(X/\mathcal{K}) = 0$, and thus $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X = 0$. □

Remark 6.6. Recall that Molino's desingularization $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{\mathcal{K}})$ of $(X, \mathcal{K})$ is an RF that is taut if and only if $\mathcal{K}_R$ is taut [RPSAW08, Remark 2.4.3]. Nevertheless, Corollary 1.2 cannot be proved directly from that fact, because the desingularization of a simply connected manifold may not be simply connected.

As in the regular case, cohomological tautness can be detected by using some other cohomological groups. The first one is the twisted cohomology $H^0_\kappa(X/\mathcal{K})$ where κ is any representative of the Álvarez class $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X$.

Proposition 6.7. *Let X be a connected compact manifold endowed with an SRF $\mathcal{K}$. The following two statements are equivalent:*
(a) *The foliation $\mathcal{K}$ is cohomologically taut*
(b) *The cohomology group $H^0_\kappa(X/\mathcal{K})$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}$.*
Otherwise, $H^0_\kappa(X/\mathcal{K}) = 0$.

Proof. We proceed in two steps.
(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b). If $\mathcal{K}$ is cohomologically taut then $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_X = [\kappa] = 0$. So, $H^0_\kappa(X/\mathcal{K}) \cong H^0(X/\mathcal{K}) = \mathbb{R}$.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a). From Theorem 6.5 it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{K}_R$ is a taut foliation; that is, that $H^0_{\kappa_R}(R/\mathcal{K}) \neq 0$ (cf. [RPSAW09, Theorem 3.5]). Proceeding as in Proposition 6.3, we get that the restriction $\iota_R \colon H^0_\kappa(X/\mathcal{K}) \to H^0_{\kappa_R}(R/\mathcal{K})$ is a monomorphism. This gives (a).

Since $H^0_{\kappa_R}(R/\mathcal{K}) = 0$ or $\mathbb{R}$ (cf. [RPSAW09, Theorem 3.5]) then we get $H^0_\kappa(X/\mathcal{K}) = 0$ or $\mathbb{R}$. □

The second one has been proved in [RPSAW05, Corollary 3.5]. Recall that a singular stratum is a *boundary stratum*[1] if there exists a stratum S' satisfying $S \preccurlyeq S'$ and $\operatorname{codim}_X \mathcal{K} = \operatorname{codim}_{S'} \mathcal{K}_{S'} + 1$. The union of boundary strata of $\mathcal{K}$ is denoted by $\partial(X/\mathcal{K})$.

Proposition 6.8. *Let X be a connected compact manifold endowed with a CERF $\mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathcal{K}_R$ is transversally oriented. Put $n = \operatorname{codim} \mathcal{K}_R$. Then, the following three statements are equivalent:*

(a) *The foliation $\mathcal{K}$ is cohomologically taut.*
(b) *The cohomology group $H^n(X/\mathcal{K}, \partial(X/\mathcal{K}))$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}$.*
(c) *The intersection cohomology group $IH^{\overline{p}}_n(X/\mathcal{K})$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}$, for any perversity $\overline{p} \leq \overline{t}$.*

The inductive construction of the Álvarez classes $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_i$ in the proof of Theorem 1.1 implies that if $S' \preccurlyeq S$ and $\mathcal{K}_S$ is cohomologically taut, then $\mathcal{K}_{S'}$ must be cohomologically taut. Nevertheless, the reciprocal does not always hold and both taut and non-taut strata can coexist, as the following example shows.

Example 6.9. ([RP, Section 3.5]) Consider the unimodular matrix $A = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ and $v = (v_1, v_2)$ one of its irrational slope eigenvectors. Denote by $\mathcal{F}_v$ the Kronecker flow induced on the torus $\mathbb{T}^2$, which can be naturally extended to the linear flow $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{S}^3}$ on $\mathbb{S}^3$ corresponding to the $\mathbb{R}$-action $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}(t, (z_1, z_2)) = (e^{i \cdot v_1 t} \cdot z_1, e^{i \cdot v_2 t} \cdot z_2)$. We consider the suspension of this action, that is, the $\mathbb{R}$-action on $\mathbb{S}^4 = \Sigma\mathbb{S}^3$, given by $\Phi(t, [(z_1, z_2), s]) = [\Phi(t, (z_1, z_2)), s]$. Its orbits define an SRF $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{S}^4}$ whose singular part consists of two fixed points: the North and South poles of $\mathbb{S}^4$. By Corollary 1.2, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{S}^4}$ is a cohomologically taut singular Riemannian flow.

The closures of the generic leaves of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{S}^4}$ are tori of dimensions 1 and 2. Take two leaves L_1 and L_2 whose disjoint closures are foliated diffeomorphic to $(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathcal{F}_v)$, and consider K_1, K_2 disjoint compact saturated neighbourhoods of $\overline{L_1}$ and $\overline{L_2}$. Then $(K_i, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{S}^4})$ is foliated diffeomorphic to $(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{D}^2, \mathcal{F}_v \times \{\text{points}\})$ for $i = 1, 2$ (see [Car84, Proposition 3]). Notice that $(\partial K_i, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{S}^4}) \cong (\mathbb{T}^3, \mathcal{F}_v \times \{\text{points}\})$, and denote by $(K_i)^\circ$ the interior of K_i for $i = 1, 2$. We construct the manifold $X = (\mathbb{S}^4 \backslash ((K_1)^\circ \cup (K_2)^\circ))/\sim$, where we have identified ∂K_1 and ∂K_2 by $(x_1, -) \sim (A \cdot x_2, -)$ for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{T}^2$. Equivalently, we can glue the boundaries of a handle $\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]$ to ∂K_i using the identification $\sim$ and the identity, respectively, for $i = 1, 2$ (see Figure 2).

Notice that the described surgery is compatible with $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{S}^4}$ and denote by $\mathcal{K}$ the singular Riemannian flow induced in X. By construction, $\mathcal{K}$ has two singular strata, both of them fixed points, and thus, trivially endowed with taut foliations. None of them are

[1] In [RPSAW05, p. 431] there's a typo in one sign of the formula of the definition, which says $\operatorname{codim}_M \mathcal{F} = \operatorname{codim}_{S'} \mathcal{F}_{S'} - 1$.



FIGURE 2. The ends of the handle are diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{T}^3$

boundary strata, and then $H^3(X/\mathcal{K}, \partial(X/\mathcal{K})) = H^3(X/\mathcal{K})$. A straightforward Mayer-Vietoris computation gives $H^3(X/\mathcal{K}) = 0$, and by (b) of Proposition 6.8 we have that $\mathcal{K}$ is not cohomologically taut.

The described surgery can be easily generalized to generate cohomologically non-taut singular Riemannian flows from cohomologically taut singular Riemannian flows.

7. Appendix

This appendix is devoted to proving Lemma 2.3.

7.1. **Some geometrical facts.** The following two lemmas will be useful to describe the local foliated structure of the charts of a tubular neighbourhood of a stratum.

Lemma 7.1. *Let M and M' be two manifolds, respectively endowed with the SRFs $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$. Consider an embedding $F\colon M \times [0,1) \to M' \times [0,1)$. If the restriction*

$$F\colon (M \times (0,1), \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{I}) \to (M' \times (0,1), \mathcal{F}' \times \mathcal{I}) \tag{7.1}$$

is foliated then

$$F\colon (M \times [0,1), \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{I}) \to (M' \times [0,1), \mathcal{F}' \times \mathcal{I})$$

is also foliated.

Proof. Notice, on one hand, that when $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are regular, the result follows directly from the local description of F.

Consider, on the other hand, $S \in \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}}$ a minimal stratum. From (7.1) there exists $S' \in \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}'}$ with $F(S \times (0,1)) \subset S' \times (0,1)$ and therefore $F(S \times [0,1)) \subset \overline{S'} \times [0,1)$. We claim that

$$F(S \times [0,1)) \subset S' \times [0,1).$$

For that purpose, let us suppose that there exists $S'_0 \in \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}'}$ with $S'_0 \prec S'$ and $F(S \times \{0\}) \cap (S'_0 \times \{0\}) \neq \emptyset$. Since $F(M \times [0,1))$ is an open subset of $M' \times [0,1)$ then $F(M \times (0,1)) \cap (S'_0 \times (0,1)) \neq \emptyset$. But this is not possible since the map $F\colon (M \times (0,1), \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{I}) \to$

$(F(M \times (0,1)), \mathcal{F}' \times \mathcal{I})$ is a foliated diffeomorphism and $S \times (0,1)$ a minimal stratum of $\mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{I}}$.

We proceed now by induction on $\operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}}$. If is $\operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$, then $\mathcal{F}$ is a regular foliation and the above considerations yield $F(M \times [0,1)) \subset R' \times [0,1)$, where R' is a regular stratum of $\mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}'}$. We get the result since the two foliations are regular.

Now, if $\operatorname{depth} \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}} > 0$, denote S_{min} the union of closed strata of $\mathcal{F}$. By induction hypothesis, the restriction

$$F\colon ((M - S_{min}) \times [0,1), \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{I}) \longrightarrow (M' \times [0,1), \mathcal{F}' \times \mathcal{I})$$

is a foliated map. Consider now $S \in \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}}$ a singular stratum. We have seen that there exists $S' \in \mathsf{S}_{\mathcal{F}'}$ with $F(S \times [0,1)) \subset S' \times [0,1)$. It remains to prove that

$$F\colon (S \times [0,1), \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{I}) \longrightarrow (S' \times [0,1), \mathcal{F}' \times \mathcal{I})$$

is a foliated map. It follows, since $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are regular. □

Lemma 7.2. *Let M and M' be two manifolds, respectively endowed with the SRFs $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$. Consider an embedding $f\colon M \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to M' \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $f(M \times \{0\}) \subset M' \times \{0\}$. Then there exists a unique embedding*

$$F\colon M \times \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,1) \longrightarrow M' \times \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,1)$$

making the following diagram commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \times \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,1) & \xrightarrow{F} & M' \times \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,1) \\ {\scriptstyle Q}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Q} \\ M \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} & \xrightarrow{f} & M' \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \end{array}$$

where the smooth map Q is defined by $Q(u,\theta,t) = (u, t\cdot\theta)$. Moreover, consider SRFs $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\mathbb{S}^n$, respectively, such that $P\colon (\mathbb{S}^n \times (0,1), \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{I}) \to (\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\backslash\{0\}, \mathcal{E})$, defined by $P(\theta,t) = t\cdot\theta$, is a foliated diffeomorphism and $\mathcal{I}$ denotes the foliation by points. Suppose that the embedding $f\colon (M \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{E}) \to (M' \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \mathcal{F}' \times \mathcal{E})$ is foliated. Then

$$F\colon (M \times \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,1), \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{I}) \to (M' \times \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,1), \mathcal{F}' \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{I})$$

is a foliated embedding.

Proof. We proceed in several steps.

• *Uniqueness.* It follows from the density of $M \times \mathbb{S}^n \times (0,1)$ in $M \times \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,1)$ and from the fact that the restriction $Q\colon M \times \mathbb{S}^n \times (0,1) \to M \times (\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\backslash\{0\})$ is a diffemorphism.

• *Existence.* Write $f = (f_0, f_1)\colon M \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to M' \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. The components f_0 and f_1 are smooth with $f_1(-,0) = 0$. So the map $h\colon M \times \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,1) \to \mathbb{R}^{n_S+1}$ defined by $h(u,\theta,t) = f_1(u, t\cdot\theta)/t$ is smooth and without zeroes. Finally, we define

$$F(u,\theta,t) = \left(f_0(u, t\cdot\theta), \frac{h(u,\theta,t)}{||h(u,\theta,t)||}, t\cdot||h(u,\theta,t)|| \right).$$

• *Embedding.* Since $f = (f_0, f_1)$ is an embedding with $f_1(-,0) = 0$, then each restriction $f_1(u,-)\colon \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is an embedding . Put $G_u = f_1(u,-)_{*0}$ its differential at 0,

which is an isomorphism. By construction we have $h(u,\theta,0) = G_u(\theta)/||G_u(\theta)||$. So each restriction $F\colon \{u\}\times\mathbb{S}^n\times\{0\}\to\{f_0(u,0)\}\times\mathbb{S}^n\times\{0\}$ is a diffeomorphism.

Now, consider $(u_i,\theta_i)\in M\times\mathbb{S}^n$ for $i=1,2$ such that $F(u_1,\theta_1,0)=F(u_2,\theta_2,0)$. Since f is an embedding both $(u_i,\theta_i,0)$ live on the same fiber $\{u\}\times\mathbb{S}^n\times\{0\}$. Since G_u is an isomorphism, we get that F is an embedding .

• *Foliated.* The restriction $F\colon (M\times\mathbb{S}^n\times(0,1),\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{I})\to(M'\times\mathbb{S}^n\times(0,1),\mathcal{F}'\times\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{I})$ is a foliated embedding since the restriction $Q\colon (M\times\mathbb{S}^n\times(0,1),\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{I})\to(M\times\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\backslash\{0\},\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{E})$ is a foliated diffeomorphism. Now, it suffices to apply Lemma 7.1 to F. □

7.2. **Lifting of charts.** Assume the notation of Sections 2.3-2.5, some of which we recall now. As the foliation $\mathcal{E}_S$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n_S+1}$ is invariant by homotheties, there exists a foliation $\mathcal{G}_S$ on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n_S}$ such that the map $P\colon (\mathbb{S}^{n_S}\times(0,1),\mathcal{G}_S\times\mathcal{I})\to(\mathbb{R}^{n_S+1}\backslash\{0\},\mathcal{E}_S)$, where $\mathcal{I}$ denotes the 0-dimensional foliation, is a foliated diffeomorphism. The foliation $\mathcal{G}_S$ is an SRF (see [Mol88]).

We put $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ two atlases of the tubular neighborhood $\tau_S\colon T_S\to S$ whose structure groups are, respectively, $O(n_S+1)$ and $\mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{D}^{n_S+1},\mathcal{E}_S)$. Recall the foliated smooth map $\mathscr{L}_S\colon (D_S\times[0,1),\mathcal{K}\times\mathcal{I})\to(T_S,\mathcal{K})$ defined by $\mathscr{L}_S(z,t)=2t\cdot z$. The restriction $\mathscr{L}_S\colon (D_S\times(0,1),\mathcal{K}\times\mathcal{I})\to(T_S\backslash S,\mathcal{K})$ is a foliated diffeomorphism. Notice that any chart $(U,\psi)\in\mathcal{A}$ satisfies $\psi(v,t\cdot\theta)=t\cdot\psi(v,\theta)$ and induces a lifted diffeomorphism $\overline{\psi}$ that makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U\times\mathbb{S}^{n_S}\times[0,1) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\psi}} & D_S\times[0,1) \\ {\scriptstyle Q}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathscr{L}_S} \\ U\times\mathbb{D}^{n_S+1} & \xrightarrow{\psi} & T_S, \end{array} \tag{7.2}$$

where $\overline{\psi}(u,\theta,t)=(\psi(u,1/2\cdot\theta),t)$. The following lemma proves that the same lifting property holds for the charts of $\mathcal{B}$.

Lemma 7.3. *Let (U,φ) be a chart of $\mathcal{B}$. Then there exists a foliated embedding $\overline{\varphi}\colon (U\times\mathbb{S}^{n_S}\times[0,1),\mathcal{K}\times\mathcal{G}_S\times\mathcal{I})\to(D_S\times[0,1),\mathcal{K}\times\mathcal{I})$ making the following diagram commute:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U\times\mathbb{S}^{n_S}\times[0,1) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\varphi}} & D_S\times[0,1)\ . \\ {\scriptstyle Q}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathscr{L}_S} \\ U\times\mathbb{D}^{n_S+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & T_S \end{array}$$

Proof. Take a chart $(U,\psi)\in\mathcal{A}$. Notice that the lifted map $\overline{\psi}$ (see (7.2)) is an embedding and the composition $h=\psi^{-1}\circ\varphi$ is a diffeomorphism. By the first part of Lemma 7.2, h can be lifted to the diffeomorphism $H\colon U\times\mathbb{S}^{n_S}\times[0,1)\to U\times\mathbb{S}^{n_S}\times[0,1)$ and defining

$\overline{\varphi} = \overline{\psi} \circ H$ we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \overline{\varphi} & & \\
 & \overset{\frown}{\longrightarrow} & & \overset{\frown}{\longrightarrow} & \\
U \times \mathbb{S}^{n_S} \times [0,1) & \xrightarrow[H]{} & U \times \mathbb{S}^{n_S} \times [0,1) & \xrightarrow[\overline{\psi}]{} & D_S \times [0,1) \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle Q} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Q} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathscr{L}_S} \\
U \times \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1} & \xrightarrow{\quad h \quad} & U \times \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1} & \xrightarrow{\quad \psi \quad} & T_S \\
 & \underset{\smile}{\longrightarrow} & & \underset{\smile}{\longrightarrow} & \\
 & & \varphi & &
\end{array}$$

The restriction $\overline{\varphi}\colon (U \times \mathbb{S}^{n_S} \times (0,1), \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{G}_S \times \mathcal{I}) \to (D_S \times (0,1), \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{I})$ is a foliated embedding since the restrictions $Q\colon (U \times \mathbb{S}^{n_S} \times (0,1), \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{G}_S \times \mathcal{I}) \to (U \times \mathbb{R}^{n_S+1} \backslash \{0\}, \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{E}_S)$ and $\mathscr{L}_S\colon (D_S \times (0,1)) \to (T_S \backslash S, \mathcal{K})$ are foliated diffeomorphisms (cf. 6.1). Now, it suffices to apply the Lemma 7.1 to $\overline{\varphi}$. The uniqueness of $\overline{\varphi}$ follows by density. □

7.3. **Proof of Proposition 2.3.** For each $(U, \varphi) \in \mathcal{B}$ we define

$$\overline{\overline{\varphi}}\colon (U \times \mathbb{S}^{n_S}, \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{G}_S) \to (D_S, \mathcal{K})$$

by $\overline{\overline{\varphi}}(u, \theta) = \operatorname{pr} \overline{\varphi}(u, \theta, 0)$, where $\operatorname{pr}\colon D_S \times [0,1) \to D_S$ is the canonical projection and $\overline{\varphi}$ comes from Lemma 7.3. Notice that $\overline{\overline{\varphi}}$ is a foliated embedding. Since $\mathscr{L}_S(z, 0) = \tau_S(z)$ for each $z \in D_S$, we have

$$\tau_S \overline{\overline{\varphi}}(u, \theta) = \tau_S \operatorname{pr} \overline{\varphi}(u, \theta, 0) = \mathscr{L}_S(\operatorname{pr} \overline{\varphi}(u, \theta, 0), 0) = \mathscr{L}_S \overline{\varphi}(u, \theta, 0) = \varphi Q(u, \theta, 0) = \varphi(u) = u.$$

We conclude that $\mathcal{C} = \{(U, \overline{\overline{\varphi}}) \mid (U, \varphi) \in \mathcal{B})\}$ is an atlas of the sphere bundle $\tau_s\colon D_S \to S$. By construction, the structure group preserves $\mathcal{G}_S$. It remains to prove that it also belongs to the orthogonal group $O(n_S + 1)$.

Consider $(U_i, \overline{\overline{\varphi_i}}), (U_j, \overline{\overline{\varphi_j}}) \in \mathcal{C}$. In the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
U_i \cap U_j \times \mathbb{S}^{n_S} \times [0,1) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\varphi_i}^{-1} \circ \overline{\varphi_j}} & U_i \cap U_j \times \mathbb{S}^{n_S} \times [0,1) \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle Q} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Q} \\
U_i \cap U_j \times \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_i^{-1} \circ \varphi_j} & U_i \cap U_j \times \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1},
\end{array}$$

(cf. Lemma 7.3) the two horizontal rows are foliated diffeomorphisms. The top map is determined by the bottom map as described in the proof of Lemma 7.2. So for each $(u, \theta, 0) \in U_i \cap U_j \times \mathbb{S}^{n_S} \times [0,1)$ we get

$$\overline{\varphi_i}^{-1} \circ \overline{\varphi_j}(u, \theta, 0) = (u, G_u(\theta)/||G_u(\theta)||, 0).$$

This equality yields

$$\overline{\overline{\varphi_i}}^{-1} \circ \overline{\overline{\varphi_j}}(u, \theta) = (u, G_u(\theta)/||G_u(\theta)||).$$

The linear map G_u is the differential of the smooth map $f_{i,j}(u, —)\colon \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1} \to \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1}$, where $\varphi_i^{-1} \circ \varphi_j(u, \theta) = (u, f_{i,j}(u, \theta))$. Since $(U_i, \varphi_i) \in \mathcal{B}$ then $|\varphi_i(u, v)| = |v|$ for each

$(u, v) \in U \times \mathbb{D}^{n_S+1}$. So we get that $G_u \in O(n_S + 1)$. We have finished, since

$$\overline{\overline{\varphi_i}}^{-1} \circ \overline{\overline{\varphi_j}}(u, \theta) = (u, G_u(\theta)). \quad \square$$

References

[AL92] J. A. Alvarez López, *The basic component of the mean curvature of Riemannian foliations*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **10** (1992), no. 2, 179–194. MR 1175918 (93h:53027)

[BM93] H. Boualem and P. Molino, *Modèles locaux saturés de feuilletages riemanniens singuliers*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **316** (1993), no. 9, 913–916. MR 1218287 (94b:53058)

[Car84] Y. Carrière, *Flots riemanniens*, Astérisque (1984), no. 116, 31–52, Transversal structure of foliations (Toulouse, 1982). MR 755161

[CE97] G. Cairns and R. H. Escobales, Jr., *Further geometry of the mean curvature one-form and the normal plane field one-form on a foliated Riemannian manifold*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A **62** (1997), no. 1, 46–63. MR 1427628 (97m:53050)

[Dom98] D. Domínguez, *Finiteness and tenseness theorems for Riemannian foliations*, Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), no. 6, 1237–1276. MR 1657170 (99k:53045)

[Ghy84] É. Ghys, *Feuilletages riemanniens sur les variétés simplement connexes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **34** (1984), no. 4, 203–223. MR 766280 (86c:57025)

[Hae73] A. Haefliger, *Sur les classes caractéristiques des feuilletages*, Séminaire Bourbaki, 24ème année (1971/1972), Exp. No. 412, Springer, Berlin, 1973, pp. 239–260. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 317. MR 0420655

[Hae80] ———, *Some remarks on foliations with minimal leaves*, J. Differential Geom. **15** (1980), no. 2, 269–284 (1981). MR 614370 (82j:57027)

[KT83] F. W. Kamber and P. Tondeur, *Foliations and metrics*, Differential geometry (College Park, Md., 1981/1982), Progr. Math., vol. 32, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983, pp. 103–152. MR 702530 (85a:57017)

[KT84] ———, *Duality theorems for foliations*, Astérisque (1984), no. 116, 108–116, Transversal structure of foliations (Toulouse, 1982). MR 755165 (86i:57033)

[Mas92] X. Masa, *Duality and minimality in Riemannian foliations*, Comment. Math. Helv. **67** (1992), no. 1, 17–27. MR 1144611 (93g:53040)

[Mat12] J. Mather, *Notes on topological stability*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **49** (2012), no. 4, 475–506. MR 2958928

[Mol88] P. Molino, *Riemannian foliations*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 73, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988, Translated from the French by Grant Cairns, With appendices by Cairns, Y. Carrière, É. Ghys, E. Salem and V. Sergiescu. MR 932463 (89b:53054)

[MW06] V. Miquel and R. A. Wolak, *Minimal singular Riemannian foliations*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **342** (2006), no. 1, 33–36. MR 2193392 (2006i:53029)

[Noz10] H. Nozawa, *Rigidity of the Álvarez class*, Manuscripta Math. **132** (2010), no. 1-2, 257–271. MR 2609297

[Noz12] ———, *Haefliger cohomology of Riemannian foliations*, ArXiv e-prints (2012).

[NRP14] H. Nozawa and J. I. Royo Prieto, *Tenseness of Riemannian flows*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **64** (2014), no. 4, 1419–1439. MR 3329668

[RP] J. I. Royo Prieto, *Estudio cohomológico de flujos riemannianos*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, 2003. http://www.ehu.eus/joseroyo/pdf/tesis.pdf

[RPSAW05] J. I. Royo Prieto, M. Saralegi-Aranguren, and R. Wolak, *Top-dimensional group of the basic intersection cohomology for singular Riemannian foliations*, Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math. **53** (2005), no. 4, 429–440. MR 2214932 (2006m:53042)

[RPSAW08] ———, *Tautness for Riemannian foliations on non-compact manifolds*, Manuscripta Math. **126** (2008), no. 2, 177–200. MR 2403185 (2010e:53052)

[RPSAW09] J. I. Royo Prieto, M. Saralegi-Aranguren, and R. Wolak, *Cohomological tautness for Riemannian foliations*, Russ. J. Math. Phys. **16** (2009), no. 3, 450–466. MR 2551892 (2010j:53043)

[Rum79] H. Rummler, *Quelques notions simples en géométrie riemannienne et leurs applications aux feuilletages compacts*, Comment. Math. Helv. **54** (1979), no. 2, 224–239. MR 535057 (80m:57021)

[Ste74] P. Stefan, *Accessible sets, orbits, and foliations with singularities*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **29** (1974), 699–713. MR 0362395 (50 #14837)

[Sul79] D. Sullivan, *A homological characterization of foliations consisting of minimal surfaces*, Comment. Math. Helv. **54** (1979), no. 2, 218–223. MR 535056

[Sus73] H. J. Sussmann, *Orbits of families of vector fields and integrability of distributions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **180** (1973), 171–188. MR 0321133 (47 #9666)

[Tho69] R. Thom, *Ensembles et morphismes stratifiés*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **75** (1969), 240–284. MR 0239613 (39 #970)

[Ver71] A. Verona, *Le théorème de de Rham pour les préstratifications abstraites*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B **273** (1971), A886–A889. MR 0290375 (44 #7559)

[Wol89] R. A. Wolak, *Maximal subalgebras in the algebra of foliated vector fields of a Riemannian foliation*, Comment. Math. Helv. **64** (1989), no. 4, 536–541. MR 1022996

Department of Applied Mathematics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Alameda de Urquijo s/n, 48013 Bilbao, Spain.

E-mail address: joseignacio.royo@ehu.eus

Fèdèration CNRS, Nord-Pas-de-Calais FR 2956, UPRES-EA 2462 LML, Faculté Jean Perrin, Université d'Artois, Rue Jean Souvraz SP 18, 62 307 Lens Cedex, France.

E-mail address: saralegi@euler.univ-artois.fr

Instytut Matematyki, Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, ul. prof. Stanisława Łojasiewicza 6 30-348 Kraków, Poland.

E-mail address: robert.wolak@im.uj.edu.pl